

REMARKS

By this amendment, the abstract, claims 1-4 and claims 6-12 have been amended. Claims 1-12 remain in the application. Support for the amendments can be found the specification and drawings. No new matter has been added. This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Examiner's Action. Reconsideration and allowance of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Specification

The specification was objected to in the Office Action as not containing a abstract meeting the requirements of "a brief abstract of the technical disclosure." The objection to the specification is traversed for at least the following reason. As presented herein, the abstract has been amended to not exceed 150 words and presented on a separate sheet. The abstract is now believed to meet the requirements of "a brief abstract of the technical disclosure." Withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Claims

Claims 1 and 7-12 were objected to because of informalities. The objection to the claims is traversed for at least the following reason. As presented herein, claims 1 and 7-12 have been amended to correct for the informalities, as appropriate. Withdrawal of the objection to the claims is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1-5 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reason. As presented herein, the claims have been amended, as appropriate, to show transformation or reduction of subject matter to a different state of thing, and thus now renders the same as being directed to statutory subject matter. For example,

independent claim 1 is directed to a method of creating a collection of relevant video segments that include *receiving* a signal containing transcript information associated with [a] program [of audio-video information], *detecting* from the signal containing the transcript information a first exclamatory syntactical element for identifying catchy and interesting video segments to be included in a video preview, *selecting* portions from the video stream, *associating* the selected portions with relevant video segments, and *generating* [a] video preview in the form of a *video trailer* or *video abstract* comprised of the collection of relevant video segments. The rejection of claim 1, as well as claims 2-5, which depend from claim 1, is now believed overcome. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

As presented herein, claim 12 has been amended to refer more clearly to a computer-readable medium embodied with a computer program configured to be loaded in memory of a computer arrangement for execution by a processing means of the computer arrangement, and thus now renders the same as being directed to statutory subject matter. The 35 U.S.C. §101 rejection of claim 12 is now believed overcome. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

CLAIM 1

Claim 1 recites a method of creating a collection of relevant video segments by selecting respective portions from a video stream, wherein the video stream corresponds to a program of audio-video information, a duration of the collection of relevant video segments being relatively short compared with a duration of the program, the method comprising:

- receiving a signal containing transcript information associated with the program, the transcript information including a plurality of sentences;
- detecting from the signal containing transcript information a first exclamatory syntactical element in the sentences, the first exclamatory syntactical element for identifying catchy and interesting video segments to be included in a video

preview;

- selecting portions from the video stream which correspond to the first exclamatory syntactical element;
- associating the selected portions with relevant video segments, and
- generating the video preview in the form of a video trailer or video abstract comprised of the collection of relevant video segments, wherein the respective selected portions from the video stream make up the collection of relevant video segments of the video preview that can be used as an overview to browse the program of audio-video information and provide a way to select from various recorded programs which ones to watch.

Support for the amendments to claim 1 can be found in the specification on at least page 2, line 2; page 3, lines 4-9; page 8, lines 4-7, 17, and 20-24; and FIG. 2, as originally filed.

As presented herein, claim 1 now more clearly articulates the novel and non-obvious distinct features thereof, as discussed below. The method as recited in claim 1 includes the gathering of fragments of relatively important scenes of a television program by selecting relatively small portions of the video stream which belong to parts of the transcript information, comprising exclamatory syntactical elements. As a result, the collection of relevant video segments is very well suitable as a video trailer or video abstract. (See, for example, the present specification on page 8, lines 20-25). The method of claim 1 thus advantageously enables the creation of a collection of relevant video segments for making a video preview more catchy and interesting and in a relatively easy way. The method of claim 1 further provides a user with overviews in the form of video previews which provide a way to browse corresponding programs and to select from various recorded programs which ones to watch.

Claims 1-3, 6-10, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Corey et al (US 5,703,655, hereinafter referred to as “**Corey**”). With respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

The PTO provides in MPEP § 2131 that

“[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim....”

Therefore, with respect to claim 1, to sustain this rejection the **Corey** reference must contain all of the above claimed elements of the respective claims. However, contrary to the examiner’s position that all elements are disclosed in the **Corey** reference, the latter reference does not disclose “... detecting ... a first *exclamatory syntactical element* in the *sentences* ... for identifying catchy and interesting video segments to be included in a *video preview* ... and *generating* the video preview in the form of a video trailer or video abstract comprised of the *collection of relevant video segments*, wherein the respective *selected portions* from the video stream make up the collection of relevant video segments ... that can be used as an *overview* to *browse* the program of audio-video information and *provide a way to select* from various recorded programs which ones to watch” as is claimed in claim 1. Therefore, the rejection is not supported by the **Corey** reference and should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable and an early formal notice thereof is requested. Claims 2-3 and 6 depend from and further limit independent claim 1 and therefore are allowable as well. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection thereof has now been overcome.

With respect to claim 7 the same has been amended in a similar manner as the amendment to claim 1. Claim 7 is thus believed allowable over the **Corey** reference for similar reasons stated herein above with respect to overcoming the

rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 7 is believed allowable and an early formal notice thereof is requested. Claims 8-10 depend from and further limit independent claim 7 and therefore are allowable as well. The 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection thereof has now been overcome.

With respect to claim 12, the same has been amended in a similar manner as the amendment to claim 1. Claim 12 is thus believed allowable over the **Corey** reference for similar reasons stated herein above with respect to overcoming the rejection of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 12 is believed allowable and an early formal notice thereof is requested. The 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection thereof has now been overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corey et al (US 5,703,655, hereinafter referred to as “**Corey**”), as applied to claims 1-3, 6-10, and 12, and further in view of Robson et al (US 7,360,234 B2, hereinafter referred to as “**Robson**”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reason. Claims 4-5 depend from and further limit independent claim 1 and therefore are allowable as well. The 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection thereof has now been overcome.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Corey et al (US 5,703,655, hereinafter referred to as “**Corey**”), as applied to claims 1-3, 6-10, and 12, and further in view of Official Notice. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reason. Claim 11 depends from and further limits independent claim 10 and therefore is allowable as well. The 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection thereof has now been overcome.

Conclusion

Except as indicated herein, the claims were not amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights they may have under the Doctrine of Equivalents. Applicants furthermore reserve their right to reintroduce subject matter deleted herein at a later time during the prosecution of this application or a continuation application.

It is clear from all of the foregoing that independent claims 1, 7 and 12 are in condition for allowance. Claims 2-6 depend from and further limit independent claim 1 and therefore are allowable as well. Claims 8-11 depend from and further limit independent claim 7 and therefore are allowable as well.

The amendments herein are fully supported by the original specification and drawings; therefore, no new matter is introduced. An early formal notice of allowance of claims 1-12 is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael J. Balconi-Lamica/

Michael J. Balconi-Lamica
Registration No. 34,291
for Edward Goodman, Reg. No. 28,613

Dated: November 11, 2009
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
345 Scarborough Road
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510
Telephone: 914-333-9611
Facsimile: 914-332-0615
File: NL030990US1

a-32658.304